

Comments on Elisabeth Schroeder and Daniel Stone's: *Fox News and Political Knowledge*

Ruben Durante
Sciences Po

12th Conference on Media Economics
Naples, October 10th 2014

Motivation

- ① Previous evidence on the impact of partisan media on voting behavior
(DellaVigna-Kaplan, 2007; Enikolopov et al., 2011)
- ② Through what channel does this effect operate?
(persuasion vs. information)
- ③ Very different welfare and policy implications
- ④ Surprisingly little evidence on this

This paper

- **Goal**

- ▶ Examine the effect of the introduction of Fox News in the U.S. on voters' political information
- ▶ Combine data on the roll-out of FN across cable markets (DVK) with survey data from three waves of ANES (2000, 2004, 2008)
- ▶ Look at the effect on overall political knowledge and on specific categories of issues
- ▶ Explore how the effect evolves over time as Fox's expansion completes
- ▶ Elucidate the mechanism (crowding-out, complementarities)

This paper

● Main findings

- ▶ Largely validates DVK's strategy and results for early stages of FN's diffusion
- ▶ No evidence of any effect of FN on overall political knowledge
- ▶ Some evidence that FN increased viewers' knowledge on issues "owned" by Republicans in 2004
- ▶ Some evidence that FN increased (decreased) viewers' knowledge on issues most (least) covered on FN in 2000
- ▶ Weaker evidence on overall sample of respondents or for overall period
- ▶ Very mixed evidence on the timing and dynamic nature of the effect
- ▶ Suggestive and very mixed evidence on possible mechanism (decline in newspaper readership, increase in online news consumption)

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude
- Say more about correlation between education and FN access

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude
- Say more about correlation between education and FN access
- Internet access major confounding factor. Can you directly control for it?

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude
- Say more about correlation between education and FN access
- Internet access major confounding factor. Can you directly control for it?
- 2008 problematic as virtually everyone had FN. Should you drop it?

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude
- Say more about correlation between education and FN access
- Internet access major confounding factor. Can you directly control for it?
- 2008 problematic as virtually everyone had FN. Should you drop it?
- Can you separate influence from demand-driven bias?
 - ▶ FN may cover more issue on which its public has stronger views

Comments and suggestions

- Important question, nice setting, some interesting results
- Thorough data organization and validation work
- Numerous and mixed results, hard to reconcile in a unified framework
 - ▶ Results vary tremendously across years in rather non-intuitive ways
 - ▶ Strongest results are also the most worrisome in terms of magnitude
- Say more about correlation between education and FN access
- Internet access major confounding factor. Can you directly control for it?
- 2008 problematic as virtually everyone had FN. Should you drop it?
- Can you separate influence from demand-driven bias?
 - ▶ FN may cover more issue on which its public has stronger views
- Measure issue “ownership” using speeches of politicians instead?

Comments and suggestions (cont.)

- Can you do more to test the dynamic nature of the effect?
 - ▶ e.g. use variable for “years since Fox access”

Comments and suggestions (cont.)

- Can you do more to test the dynamic nature of the effect?
 - ▶ e.g. use variable for “years since Fox access”
- Can you separate direct viewership effect from spillover effect
 - ▶ e.g. instrument FN viewership with FN access and compare magnitudes
- Paper is quite dense and somewhat hard-to-read
 - ▶ Shorten and move some results to appendix
 - ▶ Less focus on validation of DVK, more on your original contribution

Comments and suggestions (cont.)

- Can you do more to test the dynamic nature of the effect?
 - ▶ e.g. use variable for “years since Fox access”
- Can you separate direct viewership effect from spillover effect
 - ▶ e.g. instrument FN viewership with FN access and compare magnitudes
- Paper is quite dense and somewhat hard-to-read
 - ▶ Shorten and move some results to appendix
 - ▶ Less focus on validation of DVK, more on your original contribution
- Too many specifications/results
 - ▶ Choose a baseline specification and stick to it
 - ▶ Choose key results and discuss them in greater detail

Comments and suggestions (cont.)

- Can you do more to test the dynamic nature of the effect?
 - ▶ e.g. use variable for “years since Fox access”
- Can you separate direct viewership effect from spillover effect
 - ▶ e.g. instrument FN viewership with FN access and compare magnitudes
- Paper is quite dense and somewhat hard-to-read
 - ▶ Shorten and move some results to appendix
 - ▶ Less focus on validation of DVK, more on your original contribution
- Too many specifications/results
 - ▶ Choose a baseline specification and stick to it
 - ▶ Choose key results and discuss them in greater detail
- Additional
 - ▶ Clearer distinction between individual- and cable-market-level variables
 - ▶ Try more to distinguish your contribution from H-L's QJPS paper